

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful examination given to the present application. The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action and amended as necessary. It is respectfully submitted that the application is patentable over the art of record. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the indicated allowability of claims 3-8 if rewritten to overcome the objection and rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, claims 3-8 have been amended herein to overcome the objection and rejection(s) set forth in the Office Action.

Claims 1, 2, and 9-11 have also been amended herein in accordance with the examiner's suggestions. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 2, 4, and 6-11 and the rejection to claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 112 are requested.

Claims 12-16 have been cancelled herein.

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takashi et al. (EP 0854670). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Takashi et al. does not disclose classifying a plurality of suction nozzles into groups according to a shift amount of the plurality of suction nozzles, a first group including first suction nozzles having a shift amount within an allowable range for simultaneous suction, and a second group including second suction nozzles having a shift amount outside the allowable range for simultaneous suction, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner relies on mounting heads 10 and 11 of Takashi et al. as being equivalent to the first and second groups. The mounting heads 10 and 11 do include a plurality of sucking nozzles 20. However, the sucking nozzles 20 are not classified according to a shift amount of the sucking nozzles 20. Rather, two mounting heads 10 and 11 are employed

in Takashi et al. to alternately implement an electronic-parts mounting process, such that the speed of the electronic-parts mounting process can be increased. Classifying the sucking nozzles 20 into a first group having a shift amount within an allowable range for simultaneous suction and a second group having a shift amount outside the allowable range for simultaneous suction is absent from Takashi et al.

Because, Takashi et al. does not disclose each and every element set forth in claim 1, Takashi et al. does not anticipate claim 1 or claim 2, which depends therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of JP Patent No. 04-64283 to Tokio, et al. For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. As conceded by the examiner, the APA does not disclose mounting the sucked parts on a board wherein the suction nozzles are classified into groups according to a shift amount, a first group having a shift amount within an allowable range for simultaneous suction, and a second group having a shift amount outside the allowable range for simultaneous suction, as required by independent claim 1. Thus, the examiner relies on Tokio, et al. to make up for the deficiencies of the APA. However, Tokio, et al. merely discloses two mounting heads 10, 11 having independent drive motors employed to pick up two components and position the two components on a printed board. Tokio, et al. does not classify the two mounting heads 10 and 11 based on whether they fall within or outside an allowable range for simultaneous suction. In fact, because each suction nozzle 20 is operated independently by a corresponding drive motor in Tokio, et al., there would be no reason to classify a plurality of suction nozzles 20 into groups. Moreover, in Tokio, et al., the nozzles 20

are positioned within each of the mounting heads 10 and 11 to facilitate simultaneous sucking of the electronic parts from a parts feeder. Thus, neither the mounting heads 10 and 11 or the nozzles 20 are classified into a group having shift amount outside an allowable range for simultaneous suction.

Neither the APA nor Tokio, et al., alone or in combination, teach or suggest each and every element set forth in claim 1, thus, the combination of the APA and Tokio, et al. does not make obvious claim 1 or claims 2 and 10, which depend therefrom. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of JP Patent No. 04-64283 to Tokio, et al. and further in view of Tsubouchi, et al. (US 5,911,456). Claims 9 and 11 depend from independent claim 1, which is believed to be allowable over the APA and Tokio, et al. for at least the reasons cited above. Tsubouchi, et al. does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of the APA and Tokio, et al. Accordingly, the combination of the APA, Tokio, et al., and Tsubouchi, et al. does not make obvious claims 9 and 11.


In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest every limitation as set forth in the subject claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections based upon the references is respectfully requested.

If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of

Appl. No. 09/940,743  
Amdt. dated January 19, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of October 16, 2003

the application. It there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33906.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:   
Una L. Schumacher, Reg. No. 48998

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
Telephone: 216-579-1700

January 19, 2004